



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,591	10/28/2003	Paul Jayachandran Joseph	62020-1560	5369

24504 7590 11/22/2005

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER

CULBERT, ROBERTS P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,591

Applicant(s)

JOSEPH ET AL.

Examiner

Roberts Culbert

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the Matzke references have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 18-23 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent 6,815,329 B2 to Babich et al.

Regarding Claims 18 and 23, and referring to Figures 6A-6L, Babich et al. teach a method of fabricating a microstructure comprising providing a substrate having a sacrificial polymer layer (410) disposed thereon, disposing a framing material onto at least a portion of the sacrificial polymer layer (Figure 6F), disposing an overcoat layer (480, 490) onto the framing material to wherein the framing material substantially separates the sacrificial layer from the overcoat layer (Figure 6K) and covers portions of the sacrificial layer that would otherwise contact the overcoat layer, and removing the sacrificial layer by thermal decomposition to form an air region within the area defined by the sacrificial material. (Col. 7, Lines 27-31)

Regarding Claims 20 and 27, the overcoat layer is selected from materials such as polyimides and inorganic glasses. (Col. 9, Lines 41-58)

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding Claims 21, the dielectric framing material is selected from SiO_2 , Si_3N_4 , and SiO_xN_y .
(Col. 5, Lines 19-57)

Regarding Claims 22 and 26, the sacrificial layer is selected from thermally decomposable types such as polynorborenes. (Col. 8, Lines 57-67)

Regarding Claim 28, the step of removing the sacrificial polymer comprises heating at least a portion of the microstructure to the decomposition temperature of the sacrificial polymer.

Regarding claim 25, Babich illustrates that the framing material forms a barrier between the sacrificial layer and the overcoat layer and maintains the structural integrity of the air region. Further, Babich et al. teaches curable polymers for the overcoat layer such as polyimides, and thermally curing (annealing) or irradiating (Col. 9, Lines 58-61) after depositing over the framing material.

Regarding Claim 19, Figure 6k illustrates that the removing the sacrificial layer defines an air region within the overcoat layer the framing material engaging the air region on an inside surface and engaging the overcoat layer on the outside surface.

Regarding Claim 30, Babich teaches that thermal diffusion products may diffuse through the overcoat layer leaving a residue free hollow structure. (Col. 2, Lines 53-57)

Regarding Claim 31, Babich teaches thermal decomposition at 200-425°C. (Col. 8, Lines 45-49)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of

Art Unit: 1763

each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,815,329 B2 to Babich et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0081787 to Kohl et al.

Regarding Claim 24, Babich does not expressly teach that the sacrificial layer is 'solvent incompatible' with the overcoat. However, Babich et al does teach that materials such as polyimides are suitable for the overcoat (Col. 9, Line 49) and that thermally decomposable polymers such as polynorborenes are suitable for the sacrificial material. However, Kohl et al. teach that materials such as polyethylene carbonate and polypropylene carbonate are also suitable for the thermally decomposable polymer is forming air gap structures. (Paragraphs 67 and 74) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use equivalent materials suggested by Kohl et al. Further, selection of the recognized materials (polyimide and polyethylene carbonate for example) results in use of solvent incompatible materials as defined by applicant (See specification Page 7, last paragraph)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1763

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R. Culbert
Examiner
Art Unit 1763




Parviz Hassanzadeh
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1763